

**REMARKS**

Claims 1–24 are pending. Claims 1 and 16 are independent. Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration of this application.

**Allowable Subject matter**

At the outset, Applicants would like to thank Examiner Ly for the indication of allowable subject matter within Claims 4-15 and 20-24.

**Rejection of Independent Claims 1 and 16 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Wright (US 6,078,959) in view of Dokko (US 2001/0004599). The applicant has carefully considered the opinions of the Office, and respectfully submits that independent claims 1 and 16 are not obvious in view of Wright combined with Dokko.

As stated in the Description, the present application relates particularly to a call access control method during call initiation or cell switching **in a TDD CDMA mobile communication system** (see paragraph 2 of the Description). In a TDD CDMA mobile communication system, a time slot may be occupied by a plurality of subscribers at the same time. As described in the Description, the maximum number of subscribers to be accessed per time slot that is supported by the base station may be 6~8 (see paragraph 18 of the Description). Based on this background, the present application provides a call access control method which has the technical features as recited in Claim 1.

Wright provides a network server system that offers equity of access between network and subscriber-originated connection requests for respective pending calls, and the general object of the solution provided by Wright is to support equity of access between network and subscriber-originated connection requests at a respective network server system. Because the technical solution disclosed in Wright is **not based on the CDMA technology** (i.e., Wright does not disclose that a time slot supports a plurality of subscribers, but rather focuses on the random access signaling and connection request transmission) the solution provided in the present application cannot be disclosed or suggested by Wright. Thus Wright **can not be used as the basis for evaluating the obviousness of the present invention.**

Specifically, Wright discloses the following:

(1) column 1, lines 22 to column 2, line 17, Wright describes different mechanisms for handling the network-originated connection requests and the subscriber-originated connection requests, the disadvantages thereof and the object of the invention;

(2) column 6, lines 44-54, Wright describes a time slot allocating mechanism of the base station, specifically, the base station allocates one or more available time slots to random access signaling before it allocates time slots for either any primary service connection request, network or subscriber-originated, or any secondary service connection request, network or subscriber-originated, or alternatively, the base station allocates time slots for primary service connection requests, network or subscriber-originated, before it services any secondary service, network or subscriber-originated, connection request;

(3) column 12, lines 3-32, Wright describes that the base station network service queue and the subscriber service queue are serviced on an equality of access basis or are configured with a call priority code or value; further, it is also described the acknowledgement and page functionality;

(4) column 4, lines 43-59, Wright describes a process of channel allocation and the interaction between the subscriber and the base station;

(5) column 7, lines 12-25, Wright describes a mechanism for preventing collision;

(6) column 11, lines 29-42, Wright describes the reason why the approach put forward in an embodiment is inadequate; and

(7) column 12, lines 18-32, Wright describes that the base station network service queue and the subscriber service queue are serviced on an equality of access basis or are configured with a call priority code or value; further, it is also described the acknowledgement and page functionality.

As can be concluded from above, Wright does not disclose the process of “counting the number of accessed subscribers in all current communication time slots of the home base station for an access request to determine channel resource occupations in different time slots” as described in Claim1 of the pending application.

Moreover, Wright also discloses the following:

(8) column 2, lines 20-28, Wright describes an object of the invention, which is offering equity of access between network and subscriber originated connection access;

(9) column 8, lines 20-55, Wright describes the response of the subscriber when a denial message is received and the call blocking results;

(10) column 5, lines 65 to column 6, line 4, Wright describes the time slots may be negotiated for and allocated, or assigned to an individual subscriber with a connection request; and

(11) column 7, lines 55-61, it is described that a portion of the base station's time slots must be allocated for the transmission of poll messages and the reason thereof.

As can be concluded from above, Wright simply does not disclose the step of "comparing the channel resource occupations in the different time slots" as required by Claim 1.

Lastly, with respect to Wright, as the Office admits, Wright does not disclose "allocating idle resource units, in the time slots having available channel resources and a minimum number of accessed subscribers, to the subscriber sending the access request," as is required by claim 1. The Office relies on Dokko to make up for this deficient teaching of Wright. However, as explained below, Dokko does not disclose "allocating idle resource units, in the time slots having available channel resources and a minimum number of accessed subscribers, to the subscriber sending the access request."

Dokko discloses a channel allocation method for radio data calls having different bandwidths to each other in a radio data call processing structure between a mobile switching system and an IWF. In paragraph [0042] of Dokko, it is disclosed that *"if no  $H_0$  channel has an available bandwidth, the frame relay converting unit 12 allocates an  $H_0$  channel having the least occupied bandwidth for traffic processing of the corresponding data call"*, and in paragraph [0046], it is disclosed that *"if no  $H_0$  channel having an available bandwidth exists, the frame relay converting unit 12 allocates an  $H_0$  channel having the least occupied bandwidth for traffic processing. If, on the other hand, an  $H_0$  channel having an available bandwidth exists, the frame relay converting unit 12 allocates an  $H_0$  channel having the largest available bandwidth"*. However, since  $H_0$  channel is based on TDMA technology (see paragraph [0006], last sentence, " $H_0$  channel of an E1 link", and it is known to one of ordinary skill in the art that E1 link is based

on TDMA technology), there would not be several accessed subscribers in one time slot. That is, one of ordinary skill in the art would not come to the solution of "allocating idle resource units in the time slots having available channel resources and the minimum number of accessed subscribers to the subscriber sending the access request."

Based on the above, the applicant respectfully submits that neither Wright nor Dokko relate to CDMA technology. Therefore, they are not relevant technologies of the present application, and the solution provided by claim 1 of the present application is not obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art even if the teachings of Dokko are combined with the teachings Wright.

Therefore, the applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1 of the present application is not obvious. Accordingly, claims 2-15 dependent on claim 1 as well as the corresponding apparatus claims 16-24 are also not obvious.

Applicant, therefore, respectfully submits that, based on the above comments, the claims are not obvious over the prior art.

### CONCLUSION

In view of the remarks presented herein, Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance and should now be passed to issue. A Notice of Allowance is respectfully solicited. If any extension of time is required in connection with the filing of this paper and has not been requested separately, such extension is hereby requested. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees and to credit any overpayments that may be required by this paper under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17 to Deposit Account No. 02-2135.

Respectfully submitted,

August 21, 2008

By: 

Rothwell, Figg, Ernst & Manbeck P.C.  
1425 K Street, N.W., Suite 800  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
(202) 783-6040 (voice)  
(202) 783-6031 (fax)

Brian Rosenbloom  
Registration No. 41,276

#1524408v1